

# Glyphosate: Cancer Assessment

# Overview

- \* History
- \* IARC
- \* New Data
- \* CARC Re-Evaluation
- \* IARC/CARC differences

# History

- \* 1985 - Group C Carcinogen; Possible Human Carcinogen
  - \* Male mouse kidney tumors (**adenomas only**) - 0/50 controls; 0/50 low; 1/50 mid and 3/50 high dose
  - \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in female mice or male/female rats
- \* PWG - Evaluation of additional kidney slides of all treated groups
  - \* Adenomas: 1/49; 0/50; 0/50; 1/50
  - \* Carcinomas: 0/49; 0/50; 1/50; 2/50
  - \* Tumors Not Treatment- Related- No trend or pairwise statistical significance; no preneoplastic lesions; lack of multiple tumors;
- \* 1986 - SAP Evaluation
  - \* Group D Chemical; Not Classifiable to Human carcinogenicity
  - \* Renal tumors equivocal, mainly adenomas, no statistical significance. Recommended a DCI for repeat mouse and rat studies

# History

- \* **1991 CPRC Review**
- \* Group C: Carcinogen; Possible Human Carcinogen
  - \* Equivocal (kidney) tumor response in male mice
  - \* Lack of statistical significance - pairwise
  - \* No pre-neoplastic lesions
  - \* Magnitude of response poor 3/50 @ very high dose (4945 m/k/d)
  - \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in female mice, male or female rats
  - \* No mutagenicity/genotoxicity concerns
  - \* No SAR concerns



# IARC Evaluation - 2015

- \* Group 2A- Probable Human Carcinogen (Group 2A)
  - \* **Limited Evidence in Humans**
    - \* Positive association for Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma
    - \* Case-control - Canada
    - \* Case-control- Sweden
    - \* Case- control - Sweden (follow-up study)
    - \* Case-control - U.S.A
  - \* **Sufficient Evidence in Animals**
    - \* Positive trend for renal carcinoma and combined adenoma/carcinoma in male mice in one study
    - \* Positive trend for hemangiosarcomas in male mice in the second study
  - \* **Strong evidence for genotoxicity**
    - \* Glyphosate and glyphosate-formulations
    - \* DNA and chromosomal damage in mammals *in vivo* and in humans and animals *in vitro*.

# New Data Evaluated in 2015

- \* 1991 CPRC Data Set

- \* 1 Mouse and 2 Rat carcinogenicity studies submitted to OPP
- \* Mutagenicity studies submitted to OPP

- \* IARC Data Set

- \* 28 Epidemiology studies
- \* 2 Mouse carcinogenicity studies (1 study submitted to JMPR but not to OPP)
- \* 4 Rat carcinogenicity studies (2 studies submitted to JMPR but not to OPP)
- \* Mutagenicity studies in the published literature

- \* 2015 CARC Data Set

- \* 31 Epidemiology studies
- \* 4 Mouse cancer studies (1 more mouse study rejected due to viral infection)
- \* 7 Rat cancer studies (1 more rat study rejected due to lack of purity data)
- \* 54 Mutagenicity studies

Note: 5 Studies cited in Griem *et al* 2015 review article not evaluated by IARC

<http://informahealthcare.com/doi/abs/10.3109/10408444.2014.1003423>

# CARC Evaluation

- \* 2005 Cancer Guidelines: “Not Likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans”
- \* Evidence in Humans
  - \* No association between glyphosate exposure and cancer of: the oral cavity; esophagus, stomach; colon; rectum; colorectum; lung; pancreas; kidney; bladder; prostate; breast; cutaneous melanoma; or soft tissue sarcoma
  - \* No association between glyphosate exposure and brain cancer (gliomas); leukemia or multiple myeloma
  - \* Inconclusive for a causal or clear associative relationship between glyphosate exposure and NHL
    - \* No association in 5 case-control and 1 prospective cohort studies
    - \* Suggestive association in 2 case-control studies in Sweden
    - \* Limitations for most of these studies include: small sample size; limited power; no quantitative exposure data; no blood biomarkers (interview by questionnaires); no knowledge of product used (formulations); risk ratios with large CIs; and recall bias as well as missing data.
  - \* The literature will continue to be monitored for studies related to glyphosate and risk of NHL.

# CARC Evaluation (continued)

- \* **Evidence in Animals**

- \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in 4 studies with CD-1 mice following dietary administration at doses ranging from 85.0 to 4945 mg/kg/day for up to 2 years
- \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in 7 studies in Sprague Dawley or Wistar rats following dietary administration at doses ranging from 3.0 to 1500 mg/kg/day for up to 2 years

- \* **Evidence for Mutagenicity**

- \* No mutagenic or genotoxic concern in a wide range of *in vivo* and *in vitro* assays: negative for gene mutation, chromosomal damage, DNA damage and repair



# Epidemiology Studies: IARC and CARC

- \* IARC: Limited Evidence in Humans based on increased risk for NHL (4 studies)
- \* CARC: Epidemiologic studies does not support causal association.

## 1. Case-control - Canada: 51 exposed cases/133 controls (McDuffie *et al.* 2001)

IARC: Positive association only for those with more than 2/days/year exposure.

CARC: Increase not statistically significant (OR=1.20; 95% CI=0.87-1.8) and No adjustment made for exposure from use of other pesticides.

Note: IARC only used the  $\geq 2$  days data and not the negative association  $\leq 2$  days exposure

---

## 2. Case-Control - Sweden: 8 exposed/8 controls (Hardell *et al.* 2002)

IARC: Excess risk based on pooled analysis of 2 studies [NHL and HCL (a NHL variant)].

CARC: The excess risk (OR= 3.04; 95% CI=1.08 - 8.52) in a univariate analysis declined when study site, vital status, and exposure to other pesticides were taken into a multivariate analysis (OR=1.85; 95% CI=0.55-6.20)

Note: Few exposed cases; individual studies non-significant; large CI.

# Epidemiology Studies: IARC and CARC

## 3. Case-control - U.S.A: 36 exposed/61 controls (De Roos *et al.* 2003)

IARC: Increase in logistic regression analysis (OR=2.1; 95% CI= 1.1- 4.0)

CARC: Non significant in the hierarchical regression (OR=1.6; 95% CI=0.9-2.8)

Note: IARC used the logistic analysis in their rationale, but not the hierarchical analysis which is used to adjust for exposure to other pesticides,

---

## 4. Case-control - Sweden: 29 cases/18 controls (Eriksson *et al.* 2008)

IARC: Increase in univariate (OR=2.02; 95% CI=1.10-3.71) and multivariate analysis (OR=1.51; 95% CI=0.77-2.94)

CARC: Suggestive; statistical significance only in univariate but not in multivariate

Note: IARC noted the non-significance but included in their rationale.

---

Lack of dose-response; imprecise risk estimates with wide CI; no consistent pattern; recall bias; multiple exposures; does not support causal association

# Animal Studies: IARC and CARC

## IARC: Identifies “hazard” according to its “Preamble”

- \* The IARC assessment looks at the intrinsic ‘hazard’ of a chemical as a cancer-causing agent only. Other components of the toxicity of the chemical are not taken into account.
- \* IARC reviews only reports/studies published in the open literature.
- \* Preamble: “*sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity*” based on the occurrence of increased tumors (benign, malignant, or combination) in:
  - \* 1) two or more species of animals;
  - \* 2) two or more independent studies in one species; and/or
  - \* 3) an increased incidence of tumors in both sexes of a single species

## Animal Studies: IARC and CARC

- \* EPA: Weight-of-Evidence Approach (2005 Guidelines):
- \* tumors in multiple species, strains, or both sexes;
- \* dose-response;
- \* progression of lesions from pre-neoplastic to benign to malignant;
- \* proportion of malignant tumors;
- \* reduced latency of neoplastic lesions;
- \* both biological and statistical significance of the findings;
- \* use of the background incidence (historical control) data;



# Animal Studies: IARC and CARC

Male Mouse Kidney Tumor (MRID No.00251007)

PWG Read: Fisher's Exact & Exact Trend Test				
Tumor Type	0 mg/kg/day	161 mg/kg/day	835 mg/kg/day	4945 mg/kg/day
Adenomas <i>P</i> =	1/49 (2%) 0.4422	0/49 (0%) 1.0000	0/50 (0%) 1.00000	1/45 (2%) 0.7576
Carcinomas <i>P</i> =	0/49 (0%) 0.0635	0/49 (0%) 1.0000	1/50 (2%) 0.5051	2/50 (4%) 0.2525
Combined <i>P</i> =	1/49 (2%) 0.0648	0/49 (0%) 1.0000	1/50 (2%) 0.7576	3/50 (6%) 0.3163

IARC: Positive trend for carcinoma ( $P=0.037$ ) and adenoma/carcinoma ( $P=0.034$ ) - Cochran-Armitage trend test

CARC: Not treatment-related based on:

- No positive trend or pair-wise significance;
- No pre-neoplastic lesions;
- Low magnitude of response - 4x the Limit Dose;
- Incidences within historical control range; and

## Animal Studies: IARC and CARC

### Male Mouse Hemangiosarcomas (MRID No.49631702)

Fisher's Exact Test and Exact Trend Test Results				
Dose (mg/kg/day)	0	100	300	1000
Hemangiosarcomas	0/47 (0%)	0/46 (0%)	0/50 (0%)	4/45 (9%)
P =	0.00296**	1.00000	1.00000	0.05332

IARC: Positive trend for hemangiosarcomas (P=0.001; Cochran-Armitage)

CARC: Not treatment-related based on:

- Tumors seen only at the limit dose;
- No pair-wise significance;
- Incidences was near or the same as the upper limit (0-8%);
- Not seen in male mice in the same strain in the other 3 studies;
- Considerable inter-group variability in incidences in female mice;
- Both spontaneous and treatment-related tumors arising from endothelial cells;
- Appear in both sexes but are generally more common in males; and
- As vascular tumors, they can occur at different sites

# Mutagenicity: IARC and CARC

## IARC:

There is strong evidence that exposure to glyphosate or glyphosate based formulations is genotoxic.

Data set included:

- \* Studies that tested glyphosate-formulated products;
- \* Studies where the test material was not well-characterized (*i.e.*, no purity information was provided).
- \* Focused on DNA damage as an endpoint (*e.g.*, comet assay);
- \* Studies with limitations confounding interpretation or results
- \* Many negative studies cited by Kier and Kirkland (2013) but were not included in the IARC decision

# Mutagenicity: IARC and CARC

## CARC:

No concern for mutagenicity or genotoxicity *in vivo* and *in vitro*.  
Negative for gene mutation, chromosomal damage, DNA damage and repair

- Glyphosate was not mutagenic in bacteria or mammalian cells *in vitro*
- Did not induce chromosomal aberrations *in vitro*.
- Although some studies in the open literature reported positive findings for micronuclei induction in rodents, these findings were not replicated in the majority of the rodent micronucleus assay studies.
- There is no convincing evidence that the DNA damage is a direct effect of glyphosate, but under some conditions may be secondary to cytotoxicity or oxidative damage.



# Summary

## Epidemiological Studies

- \* No association between glyphosate exposure and site-specific cancer
- \* Case-control studies on NHL: Does not support a direct causal association
- \* Prospective cohort (AHS) study on NHL: No significant increased risk

## Experimental Animals

- \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in male or female mice in 4 studies
- \* No evidence of carcinogenicity in male or female in 2 strain of rats in 7 studies

## Mutagenicity

- \* No concern for mutagenicity/genotoxicity *in vitro* or *in vivo*

*Classification: Not Likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans*

# Around the World with Glyphosate

- \* **Australia (2013):** Currently, the weight and strength of evidence does not support the conclusion that glyphosate causes cancer in either laboratory animals or humans (APVMA, 07/2013).
- \* **Canada (2015):** No evidence of carcinogenicity in mice and rats (PRVD 2015-XX)
- \* **EU Regulation (CLP):** No classification
- \* **EFSA (2014):** Glyphosate does not show carcinogenic or mutagenic properties.
- \* **Germany (2014):** Available data do not show carcinogenic or mutagenic properties of glyphosate.
- \* **JMPR/WHO (2004):** No evidence of carcinogenicity in rats or mice
- \* **Republic of California:** California's Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) intends to list the herbicide glyphosate - the active ingredient in Monsanto's RoundUp - as a carcinogenic chemical under the Proposition 6
- \* **South Africa:** Based on current risk assessments, glyphosate poses a minimal risk to users and the general public, provided it is used according to label instructions and safety statements.